

Enhancing innovative work behavior through laissez-faire leadership, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and work engagement: The moderating role of organizational citizenship behavior in 4-star hotels

Triono^{1*}, Amiartuti Kusmaningtyas², Abdul Halik³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Economics and Business, University of August 17, 1945 Surabaya; trionopdm@gmail.com (T.).

Abstract: In a competitive environment, an employee is required to be able to demonstrate innovative work behavior in order to provide an advantage to the organization. Innovative work behavior is a complex behavior of employees who generate, introduce and implement innovative ideas (AlEssa & Durugbo, 2022). Thus, Innovative Work Behavior offers the ability to maintain competitive advantage and maintain organizational sustainability. They can create unique experiences for consumers, develop attractive new services, and improve operational efficiency. That is why individual innovative behavior in the workplace has the highest importance in achieving innovation at the organizational level. This study replicates and modifies research that has been conducted by (Gemedo & Lee, 2020), (Wei et al., 2020), (Khan et al., 2020) and the variables used are adjusted to the object of the study. The variables in question include: Laissez-faire leadership style, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, Work engagement, Organizational citizenship behavior, Innovative work behavior. The argument related to the variables used in this study is that employees are willing to behave innovatively at work if they have a leader with a Laissez-faire leadership style, which gives freedom to everyone they lead in doing work or in making decisions (Avolio, B. J., & Bass, 2001). The population in this study were permanent employees of 5 4-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra with a total of 300 people. The sample determination used the Slovin formula, with an error rate of 5% so that a sample of 171 respondents was obtained. This study uses data analysis that is adjusted to the research pattern and the variables studied. The model used in this study is a causality model and to test the hypothesis proposed in this study, the analysis technique used is SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) which is operated through the AMOS version 26 program. SEM is a multivariate statistical technique which is a combination of factor analysis and regression analysis (correlation), which aims to test the relationships between variables in a model, both between indicators and their constructs, or the relationship between constructs. The results of the study concluded that Laissez-faire leadership has no significant effect on the work engagement of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy has a significant positive effect on the work engagement of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, Laissez-faire leadership style has an effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, Entrepreneurial self-efficacy has an effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, Work engagement has a negative insignificant effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, Organizational citizenship behavior moderates the effect of Work engagement on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra.

Keywords: 4-star hotels, Enhancing innovative work behavior, Laissez-faire leadership.

1. Introduction

The rapid development of technology and increasing global competition underlie the importance of innovation to be studied in the context of this study and require every organization to not only adapt

but also to innovate continuously in order to remain competitive. The hospitality industry, especially in four-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra, is one sector that greatly requires innovative work behavior from its employees. This is due to the characteristics of the service industry which is always oriented towards the needs and expectations of customers that are constantly changing and demands that hotels not only provide good service but also dynamic, competitive, superior and sustainable. Hotels are not just about providing a place to stay, but today's customers want a unique, memorable, and appropriate accommodation experience according to their increasingly diverse needs (Moen et al., 2018). This industry is about creating experiences, an art in exceeding expectations and touching customer emotions. In this fast-paced digital era, these demands are even higher. Customers, armed with abundant information and choices, crave personal, authentic, and memorable service. To meet these expectations, hotels need to continue to innovate, both in terms of products, services, and operational processes. Innovative employees are able to read trends, understand customers' hidden needs, and translate them into creative solutions that enrich the stay experience. They are invaluable assets that make hotels not just a place to stay, but a desired destination. Innovation in work behavior can increase individual flexibility in responding to change, facilitate adaptation to dynamic conditions in the work environment, and enable the identification of creative solutions to face new challenges. Therefore, innovation is an important need for today's organizations to survive and thrive (Bracht et al., 2023). Therefore, knowledge can enhance innovation (Yasir et al., 2023).

OCB acts as an encouragement for employees to go beyond their primary duties, facilitating synergies between laissez-faire leadership, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and work engagement in encouraging innovative behavior. For example, proactive behaviors such as helping coworkers or taking initiatives will support a more collaborative work environment, which can ultimately increase collective innovation capabilities within the organization. This research on innovation in the work behavior of hospitality employees is very relevant, given the potential positive impacts that can be generated to improve performance and competitiveness in this sector. By combining the variables of leadership, self-efficacy, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior, this study will fill the gap in the literature that rarely explores the synergistic influence of these factors on innovative behavior. The results of this study are also expected to contribute to the development of theories of leadership, entrepreneurship, and organizational behavior.

This study identified several gaps in the literature and practice in the hospitality industry, specifically in four-star hotels in Lubuklinggau. One of the gaps found is the lack of empirical evidence supporting the relationship between the variables studied in this specific context. Although leadership and organizational behavior have long been the focus of research, the impact of laissez-faire leadership style on organizational performance is still not fully understood.

Theory (Bass, 1985) suggests that laissez-faire leadership style can lead to inconsistent policies and lack of clear direction, which affect team performance and motivation. However, how this leadership style interacts with entrepreneurial self-efficacy and work engagement in the hospitality context remains under-researched. In addition, there is a conflict between the theory of laissez-faire leadership which tends to provide less direction and practice in the field which demands clear and consistent direction.

(CHEN et al., 1998) showed that individuals with high levels of entrepreneurial self-efficacy are more likely to take risks and try innovative solutions, but no research has tested the interaction between entrepreneurial self-efficacy, laissez-faire leadership style, and work engagement in the context of the hospitality industry. A conceptual model that combines leadership style, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior also still requires further testing.

This study reviews and modifies the methods of previous studies to adjust the variables used with the research object, increasing the validity and reliability of the results. The focus of this study is on hotel employees

2. Literatur Review

2.1. Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory is a theory developed by Peter M. Blau and Richard M. Emerson in the 1960s. This theory focuses on social exchange between individuals in social interactions (M. Khusna Amal & A., 2008). However, Thibaut and Kelley also have significant contributions in the development of this theory. Thibaut and Kelley, two of the main leaders of this model, concluded the social exchange model as follows: "each individual voluntarily enters and stays in a social relationship only as long as the relationship is satisfactory in terms of rewards and costs."

Thibaut and Kelley in the Social Exchange theory revealed that individuals tend to maintain relationships that provide greater rewards than the costs incurred. They also argue that social relationships can be seen as a form of investment, where individuals expect adequate rewards for the investments they make.

When Social Exchange Theory is applied in the context of business organizations, this theory can help in understanding the dynamics of the relationship between employees and the organizations where they work. As stated by (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) they pay special attention to four issues: (a) the roots of conceptual ambiguity, (b) norms and rules of exchange, (c) the nature of the resources exchanged, and (d) social exchange relationships.

2.2. Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

Laissez-faire leadership is a leadership style in which the leader gives great freedom to his subordinates and avoids excessive interference in decision-making and task management (Gemedā & Lee, 2020). The term "Laissez-faire" comes from French which literally means "let them do" or "let it run by itself" (Rahman Afandi, 2013). In Laissez-faire leadership, leaders give autonomy and freedom to team members or subordinates to make decisions, organize tasks, and execute their work. Leaders who adopt this style tend to avoid excessive intervention, let team members work independently, and only provide direction or assistance when requested or if a critical situation occurs. Although Laissez-faire leadership can provide freedom and autonomy can increase motivation and innovation, this leadership style also has weaknesses. The absence of leaders who are too frequent in every decision-making and supervision can lead to a lack of direction, poor coordination, and lack of accountability in the team. Therefore, it is important for Laissez-faire leaders to stay connected with team members and provide guidance when needed to achieve organizational goals.

A laissez-faire leadership environment has several advantages. First, subordinates are freer and more flexible in organizing work. Leaders provide ample opportunities to do what they consider effective in achieving the goals set. Second, strong trust in subordinates leads to high motivation. Subordinates feel they are valued because they can make independent decisions, organize their work lives and actualize themselves. Third, subordinates have the opportunity to develop themselves. Because they are free to do their work, they can actualize themselves and become more creative in finding their own solutions to problems (Prami & Puri, 2020). Fourth, subordinates become more responsible. They realize that success depends on themselves. Thus, they are motivated to develop self-discipline and be responsible. Fifth, low turnover. Satisfied and motivated subordinates make the work environment more comfortable. They feel reliable and confident in their work, encouraging them to want to stay in the company. Sixth, the environment is more creative. Laissez-faire leadership fosters creativity because subordinates are free to explore new ideas, try new things and think outside the box. On the other hand, leaders do not give too many instructions on how something should be done or completed. Seventh, leaders have more time to think about the company's strategic goals. Because they are not deeply involved in the work of subordinates, they have more time to think about strategic aspects, especially those related to the company's long-term goals.

2.3. Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

According to Prapaskah quoted by (Hai et al., 2021) found that self-efficacy is significantly related to career, career choice goals (intentions) and work performance. Self-efficacy is a person's confidence to face problems. An entrepreneur must have self-confidence to be able to manage his business. Based on

the results of existing research, there are still many students who are not interested in becoming entrepreneurs because they lack the confidence to manage their business. In Social Cognitive Theory, factors within oneself are one of the most important factors, namely self-efficacy. Students who choose a career as an entrepreneur as their choice have certain perceptions regarding the level of attractiveness of an entrepreneurial career (career attractiveness), the level of feasibility of entrepreneurship (feasibility) and confidence (self-efficacy) to start a business, this was stated (Frazier & Niehm, 2006). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy plays an important role in influencing entrepreneurial intentions, behavior, and the results achieved. Individuals with high levels of entrepreneurial self-efficacy are more likely to identify and pursue entrepreneurial opportunities, persist in the face of challenges, and demonstrate proactive and innovative behavior. They tend to set ambitious goals, persist in the face of obstacles, and take action to overcome difficulties.

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy can be influenced by a variety of factors, including past experience, skill acquisition, learning from successful entrepreneurs, social support, and feedback. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy can be developed and enhanced through entrepreneurship education, training programs, mentorship, and exposure to role models and stories of entrepreneurial success.

Overall, entrepreneurial self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability and confidence to succeed as an entrepreneur. It includes their belief in their entrepreneurial skills, overcoming challenges, taking initiative, and expecting positive outcomes. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy plays a significant role in shaping entrepreneurial behavior, success, and willingness to engage in entrepreneurial activities.

2.4. Innovative Work Behavior

According to (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010) innovative work behavior or innovative work behavior includes exploration of opportunities and generalization of new ideas (behavior related to creativity), but innovative work behavior can also include behavior directed towards implementing change, applying new knowledge, or improving personal and/or business performance processes that are oriented towards implementing the idea into their work (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010) This is in line with the definition of innovative work behavior put forward by (Onne, 2000). Janssen explains that innovative work behavior is the deliberate creation, introduction and application of new ideas in work roles, groups or organizations, which aim to gain benefits in performance roles, groups or organizations. Jansen added that the benefits of innovation can include the functioning of the organization and provide better socio-psychological benefits for individual workers or groups of individuals. This is like a more appropriate match between the appreciation of job demands and worker resources, increased job satisfaction, and better interpersonal communication. Innovative work behavior refers to an individual's actions in creating and implementing new ideas, concepts, products, or processes that have added value and have a positive impact on the organization. It involves an individual's ability to think creatively, generate new ideas, transform ideas into real actions, and overcome obstacles in implementing innovation.

2.5. Work Engagement

Work engagement is a very broad concept consisting of various structures and also multi-dimensional experiences, including emotions, cognitions, and behaviors, because people involved in the work are energetic and enthusiastic to participate in carrying out the work (A. B. Bakker et al., 2008). Every individual is not only enthusiastic and full of energy, but they also like to participate in a job, see problems as challenges, and often feel immersed in their work.

Work engagement is a positive feeling, motivation, and work-related psychological state characterized by enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption (Gemeda & Lee, 2020) and (A. B. Bakker et al., 2022). The more work that matches a person's expectations, the higher their participation. Work involvement, also known as work engagement, refers to a psychological condition in which individuals feel emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally attached to their work. This involves feelings of enthusiasm, energy, and strong attachment to the work tasks being performed.

Job engagement is believed to have many benefits, both for individuals and organizations. Individuals who are engaged at work tend to be more productive, have higher job satisfaction, experience less stress, and are more likely to stay in their jobs long-term. Meanwhile, organizations with engaged employees tend to experience better performance, higher employee retention rates, and a more positive work culture. It is important to create a work environment that supports job engagement, by providing adequate challenge, autonomy in the work, recognition for achievements, and support from coworkers and management.

2.6. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is part of the science of organizational behavior, OCB is a form of work behavior that is usually not seen or calculated. There are two approaches to the concept of OCB, namely OCB is an extra-role performance that is separate from in-role performance or performance that is in accordance with the job description. The second approach is to view OCB from the principles or political philosophy. This approach identifies the behavior of organizational members with citizenship behavior. The existence of OCB is the impact of individual beliefs and perceptions in the organization towards the fulfillment of psychological agreements and contracts. This behavior arises because of the individual's feelings as a member of the organization who has a sense of satisfaction if he can do something more than the organization (Saleem, Sharjeel and Amin, 2013). In line with the above, OCB is a term used to identify employee behavior. This OCB refers to the construct of "extra-role behavior", defined as behavior that benefits the organization or intends to benefit the organization, which is direct and leads to the role of expectations. Thus, OCB is a functional, extra-role, prosocial behavior that directs individuals, groups or organizations (Van Dyne et al., 1995).

Other figures such as Smith also mention OCB as a worker's contribution "above and beyond" the formal job description. OCB involves several behaviors, including helping others, volunteering for extra tasks, complying with rules and procedures in the workplace. These behaviors describe "employee added value" and are one form of prosocial behavior, namely positive, constructive and meaningful social behavior that helps (IWG Sarmawa et al., 2015).

Organ defines OCB as behavior that is an individual choice and initiative, not related to the formal reward system of the organization but in aggregate increases the effectiveness of the organization. This means that the behavior is not included in the employee's job requirements or job description so that if it is not displayed, no punishment is given (IWG Sarmawa et al., 2015). The behavior or role carried out by employees is very important for a company. Various opinions that put forward the importance of employee behavior that is willing to work beyond the existing job description include those put forward by Robbins (Stephen P. Robbins, 2023) who states that successful organizations need employees who will do more than just their formal duties and are willing to provide performance that exceeds expectations.

3. Method

Metode penelitian yang akan digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode kuantitatif dengan pendekatan survei. Populasi penelitian adalah karyawan hotel Bintang 4 di kota Lubuklinggau Sumatera Selatan, sedangkan sampel penelitian akan dipilih menggunakan metode Slovin. Data akan dikumpulkan menggunakan kuesioner yang terdiri dari skala Likert. Variabel yang akan diteliti meliputi gaya kepemimpinan laissez-faire, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, innovative work behavior, work engagement, dan organizational citizenship behavior.

Analisis data akan dilakukan dengan menggunakan Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) dengan bantuan software AMOS 26 (Analysis of Moment Structures). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) merupakan pendekatan yang kuat dalam analisis data yang memungkinkan pengujian model konseptual yang kompleks. Analisis data akan meliputi uji validitas dan reliabilitas, dan uji hipotesis. Hasil penelitian akan disajikan dalam bentuk tabel, gambar dan grafik, serta akan dijelaskan secara naratif. Kesimpulan penelitian akan diambil berdasarkan hasil analisis data dan dihubungkan dengan teori yang telah dikaji dalam tinjauan pustaka. Saran-saran juga akan diberikan untuk pengembangan penelitian

selanjutnya. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah karyawan tetap dari 5 hotel bintang 4 di Lubuklinggau Sumatera Selatan dengan sebanyak 300 orang.

4. Result

4.1. Model Feasibility Test

The test of the model hypothesis shows that this research model is in accordance with the data or fits the existing data, as well as the results of the calculation of the GFI, AGFI, CFI, TLI, RMSEA indices. CMIN/DF which are within the expected value range. Thus this model can be accepted. The complete results of this research model can be seen in the following table 1.

Table 1.
Model feasibility testing indeks.

| Goodness-of fit index | Cut-off value | Hasil analisis | Evaluasi |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|
| C ² Chi-Square | Kecil | 94,198 | Baik |
| Significance Prob | ³ 0.05 | 0.017 | Baik |
| CMIN/DF | \mathcal{L} 2.00 | 1.774 | Baik |
| RMSEA | \mathcal{L} 0.08 | 0.079 | Baik |
| GFI | ³ 0.90 | 0.911 | Baik |
| AGFI | ³ 0.95 | 0.852 | Marginal |
| TLI | ³ 0.95 | 0.858 | Marginal |
| CFI | ³ 0.95 | 0.870 | Marginal |

Goodness-of-fit analysis is used to evaluate the extent to which the model built fits the observed data. In this case, the results of the analysis indicate that the model has several indicators that indicate good quality, but also several indicators that indicate improvements are needed.

The goodness-of-fit indicators that received a "good" rating are as follows:

1. C2 Chi-Square: A small value indicates a good fit between the model and the observed data. With a value of 94.117, a good rating corresponds to a small cut-off value.
2. Significance Prob: The probability of significance indicates that the model has high statistical significance. With a value of 0.017 which is greater than the cut-off value of 0.05, indicating that the model significantly fits the data.
3. CMIN/DF: A value close to 1 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 1.774, a good rating corresponds to a small cut-off value.
4. RMSEA: A value smaller than 0.08 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 0.079, a good assessment corresponds to a small cut-off value.
5. GFI: A value greater than 0.90 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 0.911, a good assessment corresponds to a large cut-off value.

However, there are several indicators that receive a "marginal" assessment, indicating that there is room for improvement:

1. AGFI: A value greater than 0.95 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 0.852, a marginal assessment indicates that there is room for improvement.
2. TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index): A value greater than 0.95 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 0.858, a marginal assessment indicates that there is room for improvement.
3. CFI (Comparative Fit Index): A value greater than 0.95 indicates a good fit between the model and the data. With a value of 0.870, a marginal assessment indicates that there is room for improvement.

Table 2.
Regression weights: (Group number 1 - Default model).

| | | | | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P | Label |
|----------------|------|------|-----|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| H ₁ | LFLS | ---> | WE | 0.025 | 0.096 | 0.259 | 0.795 | TS |
| H ₂ | ESE | ---> | WE | 0.824 | 0.098 | 8.384 | *** | S |
| H ₃ | LFLS | ---> | IWB | -0.121 | 0.117 | -1.034 | 0.301 | TS |
| H ₄ | ESE | ---> | IWB | 0.910 | 0.336 | 2.706 | 0.007 | S |
| H ₅ | WE | ---> | IWB | -1.579 | 0.886 | -1.782 | 0.075 | TS |
| H ₆ | WE | ---> | OCB | 1.026 | 0.073 | 14.145 | *** | S |
| H ₆ | OCB | ---> | IWB | 1.572 | 0.769 | 2.046 | 0.041 | S |

4.2. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Analysis

With a low Estimate value (0.025), it indicates that the effect of LFLS on WE may not be large. The low C.R. value (0.259) also shows that this relationship is not far from zero in the sampling distribution, indicating that the relationship may not be significant. Most importantly, the high p-value (0.795) is far above the common threshold for statistical significance (usually 0.05 or 0.01), indicating that the relationship between LFLS and WE is not statistically significant.

Thus, we can conclude that there is insufficient evidence to state that there is a significant relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and work engagement levels. This means that in the context of this study, LFLS does not have a strong or significant effect on WE.

The results of the influence of the Laissez Faire leadership style variable on Work Engagement are not significant, this means that the Laissez Faire leadership style at the 4-star hotel in Lubuklinggau has no impact at all on employee work engagement. This can be caused by data on education levels that the majority of employees are educated at high school (SLTA), in addition to the relatively young age, which is an age that really needs guidance so that when leaders who interfere minimally and leaders who have low supervision will not make employees feel comfortable and have no engagement in their work.

With a fairly high Estimate value (0.824), this shows that the influence of ESE on WE is positive and may be quite strong. The very high C.R. value (8.384) indicates that this relationship is statistically very significant, because it far exceeds the critical value usually used to determine significance (for example, a critical value of 1.96 for $p < 0.05$ in a two-tailed test).

Most importantly, the p-value marked with *** indicates that this relationship is very statistically significant. In the context of social and behavioral research, *** usually indicates a very low p-value (e.g., $p < 0.001$), which means that the likelihood that the observed relationship is due to chance is very small.

Thus, we can conclude that ESE has a positive and highly significant effect on WE. This means that employees with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to show higher levels of work engagement. This study supports the idea that increasing employee self-efficacy can be an effective strategy to increase their engagement in work.

The results of the influence of Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (ESE) on Work Engagement (WE) are positive and significant, meaning that the relationship between these two variables is unidirectional, meaning that when employees have individual confidence in their ability to succeed, they will have stronger motivation to be involved in work, and feel more energetic, focused and enthusiastic in carrying out their duties as hotel employees. Likewise, employees grow positive feelings about work, a sense of pride in their achievements, and a strong relationship between individuals and the work they do. This can be in line with and supported by their age which is still productive on average.

The relationship between LFLS (Laissez-Faire Leadership Style) and IWB (Innovative Work Behavior) based on the given values is as follows:

1. The estimate (estimated effect of LFLS on IWB) is -0.121, indicating a negative relationship between LFLS and IWB. This means that the higher the level of LFLS, the lower the level of IWB observed, or vice versa.

2. The Standard Error (S.E.) of this estimate is 0.117, which provides information about the variability of the estimated effect.
3. The Critical Ratio (C.R.) value for this relationship is -1.034. A C.R. value lower than ± 1.96 indicates that the relationship is not statistically significant at the standard confidence level.
4. The p-value for this relationship is 0.301, which is well above the common threshold for statistical significance (usually 0.05). This shows that there is not enough evidence to state that the relationship between LFLS and IWB is statistically significant.

Thus, it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and innovative work behavior based on the data provided. This shows that in the context of this study, LFLS does not have a significant effect on IWB.

The results of the influence of laissez-faire leadership style on innovative work behavior are not significant. LFLS has no impact at all on the IWB of 4-star hotel employees in Lubuklinggau.

The relationship between ESE (Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy) and IWB (Innovative Work Behavior) based on the values given are as follows:

1. The estimate for the relationship between ESE and IWB is 0.910, which indicates a strong positive influence of ESE on IWB. The higher the employee's self-efficacy, the higher the innovative work behavior they show.
2. The Standard Error (S.E.) of this Estimate is 0.336, which provides information about the level of uncertainty or variability of the estimated effect. • The Critical Ratio (C.R.) value for this relationship is 2.706. This value exceeds the common threshold of 1.96 for statistical significance at the 95% confidence level, indicating that this relationship is statistically significant.
3. The p-value for this relationship is 0.007, which is well below the common threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. This indicates that there is a very small chance that the observed relationship is the result of random variation.

Thus, it can be concluded that ESE has a positive and statistically significant relationship with IWB. This suggests that an increase in employee self-efficacy can contribute to increased innovative behavior in the workplace. This is an important finding that can be used by organizations to design interventions aimed at improving employee self-efficacy as a way to encourage innovation.

The results of the influence of ESE on IWB are positive and significant, meaning that the relationship between the two variables is in the same direction if employee ESE increases, employee IWB increases and vice versa if employee ESE decreases, employee IWB will decrease.

The relationship between WE (Work Engagement) and IWB (Innovative Work Behavior) based on the information provided is as follows:

1. The estimate for the relationship between WE and IWB is -1.579, which indicates a strong negative influence of WE on IWB. This means that the higher the level of work engagement (WE), the lower the level of innovative work behavior (IWB) observed, or vice versa.
2. The Standard Error (S.E.) of this Estimate is 0.886, which provides information about the level of uncertainty or variability of the estimated influence.
3. The Critical Ratio (C.R.) value for this relationship is -1.782. This value does not exceed the general threshold of 1.96 for statistical significance at the 95% confidence level, indicating that this relationship is not statistically significant.
4. The p-value for this relationship is 0.075, which is above the common threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. This indicates that there is insufficient evidence to state that the relationship between WE and IWB is statistically significant.

Thus, although there is an indication of a negative relationship between WE and IWB, this relationship is not statistically significant based on the data provided. This means that in the context of this study, it cannot be concluded that the level of work engagement has a significant effect on innovative work behavior.

In addition, there is also a relationship between Work Engagement (WE) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) which is statistically significant. This relationship has a regression coefficient estimate of 1.026 with a critical ratio of 14.145 and a very low p-value. This indicates that

there is a significant positive relationship between Work Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. However, the relationship between Work Engagement (WE) and Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is not statistically significant..

Table 3.
Regression weights: (Group number 1 - Default model).

| | | | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P |
|-----------|------|-----|-----------------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| WE | ---> | IWB | 0.225 | 0.058 | 3.857 | *** |
| OCB | ---> | IWB | 0.023 | 0.102 | 0.222 | 0.824 |
| INTERAKSI | ---> | IWB | 0.011 | 0.002 | 5.789 | *** |

4.3. Moderation Analysis

From the data table above, it can be interpreted that there is a positive (unidirectional) and significant influence of Work Engagement on Innovative Work Behavior, meaning that every one change in Work Engagement causes a change of 0.225 in Innovative Work Behavior. On the other hand, the relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Innovative Work Behavior is not significant, but when Organizational Citizenship Behavior becomes a moderating variable, the results are significant. This means that every unit of change in INTERACTION causes a change of 0.011 in IWB.

5. Conclusion

The conclusion drawn based on the results of statistical data analysis of Laissez-Faire Leadership Style, Entrepreneurial Self Efficacy and Work Engagement to improve Innovative Work Behavior with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a moderating variable in employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra is:

The first hypothesis Laissez-faire leadership style has no significant effect on work engagement of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. This result is evidence that Laissez-faire leadership style has no impact on work engagement, or it can be said that its effect is not significant. The second hypothesis Entrepreneurial self-efficacy has a significant effect on work engagement of employees of 4-Star Hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. Both variables Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and work engagement have a unidirectional relationship and the effect of Entrepreneurial self-efficacy on work engagement is significant. The third hypothesis Laissez-faire leadership style has a negative but insignificant effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. The relationship between the variables Laissez-faire leadership style and innovative work behavior is not in the same direction and has no impact, therefore the influence of the relationship is not meaningful. The fourth hypothesis Entrepreneurial self-efficacy has a positive and significant effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. The relationship between the two variables Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and innovative work behavior is in the same direction and has an impact because the influence of the relationship has an impact. The fifth hypothesis Work engagement has no significant effect on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. The relationship between the two variables is not in the same direction Work engagement and innovative work behavior, therefore the influence of the relationship has no impact. Hypothesis Organizational citizenship behavior moderates the influence of Work engagement on the innovative work behavior of employees of 4-star hotels in Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. This moderation effect is positive and significant, which makes the relationship meaningful, therefore it has an impact.

Copyright:

© 2024 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- [1] Abun, D., Calipjo, M. G., Valdez, E. B., Ruadap-Macaspac, L. G., & Fredolin, J. P. (2023). The Effect of Innovative Leadership, Employees' Innovative Knowledge and Skills on the Innovative Work Behavior of Employees. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2(2), 340–358. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4454812>
- [2] Ágotnes, K. W., Skogstad, A., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., Espevik, R., Bakker, A. B., & Einarsen, S. V. (2021). Daily work pressure and exposure to bullying-related negative acts: The role of daily transformational and laissez-faire leadership. *European Management Journal*, 39(4), 423–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2020.09.011>
- [3] Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 13). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1015921>
- [4] Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>
- [5] Bass, B. M. (n.d.). *LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE BEYOND EXPECTATIONS EXPECTATIONS*.
- [6] *Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- [7] Cui, Y., Ma, Z., Wang, L., Yang, A., Liu, Q., Kong, S., & Wang, H. (2023). A survey on big data-enabled innovative online education systems during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 8(1), 100295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100295>
- [8] De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x>
- [9] Dekoulou, P., & Trivellas, P. (2015). Measuring the Impact of Learning Organization on Job Satisfaction and Individual Performance in Greek Advertising Sector. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1212>
- [10] Demircioglu, M. A., Hameduddin, T., & Knox, C. (2023). Innovative work behaviors and networking across government. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 89(1), 145–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523211017654>
- [11] Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569–591. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569>
- [12] Fauzi, H. (2021). *Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior at PDAM Head Office Majalengka Regency*. 11(1), 212–218.
- [13] Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590610715022>
- [14] Fisher, R. A. (1956). *Statistical Methods and Statistical Inference* (p. 181).
- [15] Frazier, B., & Niehm, L. (2006). Predicting the entrepreneurial intentions of non-business majors: A preliminary investigation. *Proceedings of the USASBE/SBI Conference*, 14–17. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.334.2930&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [16] Freire, C., & Gonçalves, J. (2021). The relationship between responsible leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094705>
- [17] Gary Yukl University. (2008). *Leadership in Organizations* (Sally Yagan (ed.)). University at Albany State University of New York.
- [18] Gameda, H. K., & Lee, J. (2020). Leadership styles, work engagement and outcomes among information and communications technology professionals: A cross-national study. *Heliyon*, 6(4), e03699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03699>
- [19] Grošelj, M., Černe, M., Penger, S., & Grah, B. (2020). Authentic and transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour: the moderating role of psychological empowerment. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(3), 677–706. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-10-2019-0294>
- [20] Kuok, A. C. H., & Taormina, R. J. (2017). *Work engagement : Evolution of the concept and a new inventory Research Articles Work Engagement: Evolution of the Concept and a New Inventory*. 10(2)(October), 262–287. <https://doi.org/10.5964/psyc.v10i2.236>
- [21] Lai, F. Y., Tang, H. C., Lu, S. C., Lee, Y. C., & Lin, C. C. (2020). Transformational Leadership and Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 2303–2326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019899085>
- [22] Lambe, C. J., Wittmann, C. M., & Spekman, R. E. (n.d.). *Social Exchange Theory and Research on Business-to-Business Relational Exchange Social Exchange Theory and Research on Business-to-Business Relational Exchange*. June 2014, 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1300/J033v08n03>
- [23] Lim, B. T. H., & Loosemore, M. (2017). ScienceDirect The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *JPMIA*, 35(2), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.016>
- [24] Liñán, F., & Chen, Y.-W. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Baylor University*, 593–617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x>

- [25] Lu, Y., Hu, X. M., Huang, X. L., Zhuang, X. D., Guo, P., Feng, L. F., Hu, W., Chen, L., Zou, H., & Hao, Y. T. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction, work stress, work-family conflict, and turnover intention among physicians in Guangdong, China: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*, 7(5), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014894>
- [26] M. Khusna Amal, M. S., & A. (2008). *STATE OF THE ART TEORI PERTUKARAN SOSIAL: Dari Teori Pertukaran Sosial Klasik sampai Teori Pertukaran Sosial Kontemporer*.
- [27] McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- [28] Moen, Ø., Tvedten, T., & Wold, A. (2018). Exploring the relationship between competition and innovation in Norwegian SMEs. *Cogent Business and Management*, 5(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1564167>
- [29] Monje Amor, A., Xanthopoulou, D., Calvo, N., & Abeal Vázquez, J. P. (2021). Structural empowerment, psychological empowerment, and work engagement: A cross-country study. *European Management Journal*, 39(6), 779–789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2021.01.005>
- [30] MOORMAN, R. H. A. G. L. B. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160204>
- [31] Mubarak, N., Khan, J., Yasmin, R., Osmadi, A., & Osmadi, A. (2021). The impact of a proactive personality on innovative work behavior: the role of work engagement and transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/loj-11-2020-0518>
- [32] Nguyen, P. D., Khoi, N. H., Le, A. N. H., & Ho, H. X. (2023). Benevolent leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors in a higher education context: a moderated mediation model. *Personnel Review*, 52(4), 1209–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2021-0234>
- [33] Norena-Chavez, D. (2022). Influence of SARS-CoV-2 on the Mediating Effect of Entrepreneurial Passion in the Relationship between Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Innovative Behavior. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, X(Issue 1), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ijeba/753>
- [34] Nur, S., Nurhayati, S., Irma, A., & Helmy, I. (2021). The impact of transformational leadership on innovative capability: Mediating role of employee optimism. 11, 435–440. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.9.025>
- [35] Sembiring, L. D., Setyawati, A., Hanika, I. M., Lie, D., & Sudirman, A. (2022). Student Entrepreneurial Interest Analysis Based on the Effect of Self-Efficacy and Social Media Utilization. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 10(11), 4212–4218. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijssrm/v10i11.em08>
- [36] Setya Mustafa, P., Gusdiyanto, H., Victoria, A., Kukuh Masgumelar, N., Dyah Lestariningsih, N., Maslacha, H., Ardiyanto, D., Arya Utama, H., Jerison Boru, M., Fachrozi, I., Isaci Selestiano Rodriquez, E., Bayu Prasetyo, T., & Romadhana, S. (2020). Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, Penelitian Tindakan Kelas dalam Pendidikan Olahraga. *Universitas Negeri Malang*, 144.
- [37] Stephen P. Robbins, T. A. J. (2023). *Organizational Behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
- [38] Stolte, J. F., & Ekeh, P. P. (1975). Social Exchange Theory: The Two Traditions. *Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie*, 1(3), 394. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3340424>
- [39] Tan, A. B. C., van Dun, D. H., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2023). Lean innovation training and transformational leadership for employee creative role identity and innovative work behavior in a public service organization. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma, ahead-of-p*(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-06-2022-0126>
- [40] Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. Van. (2022). Transformational, Transactional, Laissez-faire Leadership Styles and Employee Engagement: Evidence From Vietnam's Public Sector. *SAGE Open*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094606>
- [41] THOMAS LOCKWOOD AND EDGAR PAPKE. (2018). INNOVATION BY DESIGN. *BOO*, 213. www.careerpress.com
- [42] Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2011). Creative Self-Efficacy Development and Creative Performance Over Time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2), 277–293. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020952>
- [43] Uppathampracha, R., & Liu, G. (2022). Leading for Innovation: Self-Efficacy and Work Engagement as Sequential Mediation Relating Ethical Leadership and Innovative Work Behavior. *Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12080266>
- [44] Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17(October), 215–285. [http://www.linnvandyn.com/papers/ROB Van Dyne + Cummings & McLean Parks ERB 1995.pdf](http://www.linnvandyn.com/papers/ROB%20Van%20Dyne%20%26%20Cummings%20%26%20McLean%20Parks%20ERB%201995.pdf)
- [45] van Zyl, L. E., van Oort, A., Rispens, S., & Olckers, C. (2021). Work engagement and task performance within a global Dutch ICT consulting firm: The mediating role of innovative work behaviors. *Current Psychology*, 40(8), 4012–4023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00339-1>
- [46] Yu, J., Jin, J., Chen, F., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Digital-Enabled Public Service Innovation in China's eHealth Sector: An Institutional Logics Perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2020.3005767>
- [47] Zhang, J., Wang, Y., & Gao, F. (2023). The dark and bright side of laissez-faire leadership: Does subordinates' goal orientation make a difference? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(March), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1077357>
- [48] Zhang, X. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 24(5), 4–9. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dlo.2010.08124ead.007>

- [49] Zheng, Y., Graham, L., Epitropaki, O., & ... (2020). Service leadership, work engagement, and service performance: The moderating role of leader skills. *Group & Organization* <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119851978>